

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 8 and 13 being the independent claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0123488 to *Riikonen et al.* (hereinafter, *Riikonen*). The Examiner rejected Claims 2-7, 12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Riikonen* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0028654 to *Anjum et al.* (hereinafter, *Anjum*). The Examiner rejected Claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Riikonen* in view of *Anjum* and U.S. Patent No. 7,076,244 to *Lazaridis et al.* (hereinafter, *Lazaridis*).

Regarding the §102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 8 and 13, the Examiner contends that each element of Claim 1 is taught or suggested by *Riikonen*.

Riikonen discloses a method for synchronizing signaling messages and multimedia content loading. Specifically, *Riikonen* discloses that Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages can be used to carry payloads without having to set up a multimedia session. *Riikonen* also discloses that a URL may be placed in the SIP message instead of the payload.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that an application program corresponding to the determined type of service is automatically started prior to reception of service data.

While *Riikonen* describes that a URL may be placed in an SIP message, it fails to disclose that the type of service corresponding to the URL is also specified by the SIP message enabling an application program corresponding to the type of service to automatically start prior

to reception of the service data, as recited in amended Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1, as amended, is patentable over *Riikonen*.

The Examiner also rejected independent Claims 8 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 8 and 13 have been amended in a manner similar to that of Claim 1. In view of the above, Claims 8 and 13 are also patentable over *Riikonen*. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claims 1, 8 and 13 are allowable over *Riikonen*, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claims 2-7, 12 and 14-18, the Examiner contends that each element of the claims is taught, suggested or rendered obvious by the combination of *Riikonen* and *Anjum*. *Anjum* describes the requesting of a specific media type, and the determination of whether a called party is associated with the requested type for acceptance of a call. However, *Anjum* fails to disclose that an application program corresponding to the determined type of service is automatically started prior to reception of service data. Thus, *Anjum* fails to provide any disclosure that remedies the deficiency of *Riikonen* with respect to the independent claims above. While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 2-7, 12 and 14-18 are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claims 2-7, 12 and 14-18 are allowable over the combination of *Riikonen* and *Anjum*, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of Claims 9-11, *Lazaridis* also fails to remedy the deficiencies of *Riikonen* described above with respect to the independent claims. Thus, while not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 9-11 are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Claims 9-11 are allowable over *Riikonen*, *Anjum*, *Lazaridis*, or any combination thereof, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-18 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone

conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Registration No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Ste. 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
(516) 228-3565